

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

VICTORIA CARD,
Plaintiff,
v.

RALPH LAUREN CORPORATION, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [18-cv-02553-JSC](#)

**ORDER RE: PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
TO EXTEND DISCOVERY CUTOFF**

Re: Dkt. No. 125

The deadline to complete fact discovery in this case has been extended twice. (Dkt. Nos. 98, 110.) The current fact discovery deadline was March 31, 2021. The expert disclosure deadline was March 1, 2021. Although this case was removed to this Court on April 30, 2018, as of March 8, 2021, Plaintiff had not served *any* notices of deposition nor disclosed any experts. Finally, on March 9, 2021, Plaintiff served a 30(b)(6) deposition notice. Plaintiff's notice was untimely as the Court's civil standing order requires that all notices of deposition of fact witnesses be served at least 30 days before the close of fact discovery. The Court imposed this rule because it is difficult for depositions to be noticed and occur within 30 days; the rule thus ensures that fact discovery can be *completed* by the discovery deadline.

Now pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to continue the discovery deadlines. (Dkt. No. 125.) The Court held a hearing on the motion on April 1, 2021. For the reasons stated at the hearing, and for the reasons stated in Defendants' opposition, Plaintiff has not shown good cause for her failure to comply with the current deadline. Nonetheless, so that this case can be decided on the merits, Plaintiff may take a 30(b)(6) deposition, but no others. Further, the Court gave the parties until October 4, 2021 to disclose any experts.

A remaining issue is the scope of the 30(b)(6) deposition. The Court has reviewed

1 Plaintiff's amended notice and concludes that Defendants need not prepare a witness on the
2 following topics: Nos. 2 (except questions regarding 2(b) are appropriate), 5, 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19,
3 33, 34 and 41. The relevance of such topics, if any, is disproportional to the time needed to
4 prepare a witness, especially in light of the additional topics on which a witness needs to be
5 prepared.

6 Defendants' opposition to Plaintiff's motion sought discovery sanctions. Defendants seek
7 fees and costs for responding to Plaintiff's untimely discovery demands. Plaintiff has not had the
8 opportunity to respond. However, it is also not clear as to what discovery demands Defendants
9 refer. The Court is allowing the 30(b)(6) to go forward so no sanctions are warranted for
10 responding to the notice. And any response to the additional deposition notices was negligible.
11 The request for sanctions is denied.

12 This Order disposes of Docket Nos. 107, 125.

13 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14 Dated: April 9, 2021

15
16 
17 JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY
18 United States Magistrate Judge
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28